

AMENDMENT TO THE TITLE

Please delete the original Title and change it to read as follows:

METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR ELECTRICAL COMPONENT CONNECTIVITY

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 16-21, 29-33, 46-49, 54, 58, 63, and 65. By this Response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 16, 29, 54, and 63, canceled claims 46-53 without prejudice, and added new claims 74-76. Upon entry of the amendments, claims 1-5, 16-21, 29-35, 46-49, 54-58, 63-65, and 74-76 will be pending in the present patent application. Additionally, Applicants note that claims 6-15, 22-28, 36-45, 50-53, 59-62, and 66-73 remain withdrawn from consideration, and Applicants respectfully reserve the right to request rejoinder of these withdrawn claims at an appropriate, later time. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Objection to the Title

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Title as being “not descriptive.” Respectfully, Applicants disagree with this assertion. Nonetheless, in an interest to expedite prosecution of the present application to allowance, Applicants have amended the Title. In view of this amendment, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the Title.

Claim Rejections Under Section 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected all of the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of various combinations and permutations of the Fabian et al. reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,915,985; hereinafter “Fabian”), the Heberlein reference (U.S. Patent Appl. Pub. No. 2003/0051175 A1; hereinafter “Heberlein”), and the Wu reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,447,340; hereinafter “Wu”).

Applicants, however, respectfully assert that the cited references do not support a *prima facie* of obviousness with respect to the pending claims, because these references, taken alone or together, do not disclose all of the features recited by the pending claims. These rejections are addressed in turn below.

First Rejection Under Section 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 16-21, 29-33, 54-58, 63, and 65 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of Fabian and Heberlein. Applicants, however, respectfully submit that Fabian and Heberlein, taken individually or in combination, do not disclose all of the features recited in amended independent claims 1, 16, 29, 36, 54, and 63, and new independent claim 74.

Amended Independent Claim 1

For example, neither Fabian nor Heberlein discloses “main power conductors disposed in the enclosure to convey power from *a main source of power*,” and “secondary power conductors disposed in the enclosure to convey power from *a secondary source of power*,” as recited in amended claim 1. (Emphasis added.) Instead, Fabian—the reference relied upon for disclosure related to these features (*see* Office Action mailed July 1, 2005, pp. 2-3)—discloses a circuit breaker 14 that couples only a *single source* of power to the downstream components in the cabinet 10 it is coupled to. In the enclosure 10 of Fabian, a primary connector 22 carried by the circuit breaker 14 is mated with a connector 20 secured to the cabinet 10. *See* Fabian, col. 2, ll. 55-65. The connector 20 “carries the power that is to be protected by the circuit breaker 14.” *See id.* at col. 2, ll. 57-59. This “protected” power is routed through the circuit breaker 14 of Fabian and into the terminals 58 of the mating secondary connector 32. *See id.* at col. 3, ll. 25-30 (noting that the terminals 58 connect the contacts 56 of the mating secondary connector 32 to circuitry “within the circuit breaker 14”).

When the mating secondary connector 32 is mated with the secondary connector 24, power routed through the circuit breaker 14 is communicated to the contacts 44 and terminals 46 of the secondary connector 24. In turn, the secondary connector 24 facilitates the distribution of the power filtered through the circuit breaker 14 to the “circuitry in the cabinet 10.” *See id.* col. 3, ll. 15-17. Thus, when the circuit breaker 14

is disconnected from the connector 20, Applicants respectfully submit that *no power* is provided to the components in the cabinet 10. Simply put, the only power source in Fabian provides power via the connector 20. Accordingly, Fabian does not disclose a “secondary power conductors...to convey power from *a secondary source of power*,” as recited in amended claim 1. (Emphasis added.) Indeed, because the input terminals 58 of secondary connector assembly 24, 32 are described as *only* being coupled to the “circuitry within the circuit breaker 14,” nothing in Fabian even suggests that coupling to a secondary power source is possible, let alone suggested. The circuit breaker 14 is simply a conduit for power from the connector 20, the connector being a conduit for the only disclosed source of power in the Fabian system.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit the Fabian-Heberlein reference combination does not disclose all of the features recited in amended claim 1 and, thus, does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness against this claim. With the foregoing in mind, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent claim 1 and its respective, pending dependent claims 2-5.

**Amended Independent Claims 16, 29, 54, and 63
and the Claims Depending Therefrom**

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that the Fabian-Heberlein reference combination does not disclose an assembly or method that “remains electrically connected to the secondary power and network data conductors *to receive secondary power and network data*,” as recited in amended claims 16, 29, 54, and 63. Instead, as is discussed above, when the circuit breaker 14 of Fabian is disconnected with respect to the connector 20, the secondary connector assembly 24, 32 is also disconnected from its power source, causing the components downstream of the secondary connector assembly 24, 32 to be disconnected from power as well. Accordingly, Fabian—the primary reference—does not disclose conductors that receive secondary power; it only discloses a single power source.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference combination does not disclose all of the features recited in the instant claims and, as such, does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness against these claims. With the foregoing in mind, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent claim 16 and its respective, pending dependent claims 17-21, independent claim 29 and its respective, pending dependent claims 30-35, independent claim 54 and its respective, pending dependent claims 55-58, and independent claim 63 and its respective, pending dependent claims 64 and 65.

New Claim 74 and the Claim Depending Therefrom

In view of the foregoing discussion, Applicants respectfully submit that new independent claim 74 and its respective dependent claims 75 and 76 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

Second Rejection Under Section 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected dependent claims 5, 34, 35, and 64 under Section 103 as obvious in view of Fabian, Heberlein, and Wu. Applicants, however, respectfully submit that the addition of Wu does not overcome the deficiencies of Fabian and Heberlein, as discussed above in relation to the independent claims from which dependent claims 5, 34, 35, and 64 respectively dependent. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing dependent claims are patentable not only by virtue of their respective dependencies upon allowable base claims but also by virtue of the additional features recited therein. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of dependent claims 5, 34, 35, and 64.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are patentable and in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a teleconference will expedite prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: October 3, 2005

Manish Vyas
Reg. No. 54,516
FLETCHER YODER
P.O. Box 692289
Houston, TX 77269-2289
(281) 970-4545

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS
ALLEN-BRADLEY COMPANY, LLC
Patent Department/704P Floor 8 T-29
1201 South Second Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53204
Attention: Mr. Alexander Gerasimow
Phone: (414) 382-2000